

REMARKS

Claims 65-101 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-64 have been cancelled by previous amendments and claim 102 has been cancelled by this amendment.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102

Claims 65-67, 69-71, 78-80, 81, 83-85, 90-92, 93, 95-97, 100-102 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Sato WO 01/80590 A1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

There are three independent claims: claims 65, 80 and 92. Each claim recites a method of using a “service ID” to identify a broadcast service to facilitate the continuous reception across base station sector boundaries. Claim 65 recites a method of broadcasting that includes “providing a service ID to identify a broadcast service.” Claim 80 recites a method of broadcasting wherein a base station receives “a first broadcast service identified by a first service ID” and “a second service ID that identifies a second broadcast service received by a neighboring base station.” Claim 92 recites a method of receiving a broadcast wherein a mobile station receives “a first broadcast service identified by a first service ID from a first base station sector” and receives “a broadcast service parameters message that includes a second service ID,” which identifies a second broadcast service available from a second base station sector. The pending patent specification defines “a service ID” as an identifier for a broadcast/multicast service. (See, ¶¶ [1057]-[1058]). A broadcast/multicast service is a service provided by a content server. *Id.*

Sato discloses a broadcast system in which a radio base station provides a multicast management table to a radio terminal. The multicast management table includes the different radio channels used by neighboring base stations for each multicast. Each multicast is identified in the management table by program name consisting of an IP address.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner asserts that the use of a “service ID” as claimed by Applicant is disclosed in Sato by the management table (i.e., program title and radio channel). However, contrary to the position taken by the Examiner, the management table does not identify the multicast service. Rather, the management table identifies the content server broadcasting the multicast service by providing the content server’s IP address. Consequently, Sato’s management table cannot be used to distinguish between two multicast services broadcast from

the same content server on the same radio channel. Nor can it be used to identify a multicast service broadcast from two different content servers.

The “service ID” concept disclosed by Applicant identifies a broadcast/multicast service regardless of whether it is broadcast with another service from the same content server as illustrated in FIG. 13 of the pending patent application or whether it is broadcast by two different content servers as illustrated in FIG. 14 of the application. As such, Sato cannot anticipate independent claims 65, 80 and 92 because Sato’s multicast management table does not include a “service ID” within the meaning of the term when properly construed.

Claims 66-79, 81-91 and claims 93-101 each depend from one of the independent claims discussed above, and therefore, include all the limitations of the claim from which it depends. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable for the same reasons set forth hereinbefore as well as the additional limitations recited therein. These additional limitations need not be addressed at this time.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Claims 68, 72-75, 77, 82, 86-88, 94, 98 and 99 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly be unpatentable over by Sato in view of Chang US Patent Pub. 2002/0102967. Claims 71, 76, 85, 89 and 97 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly be unpatentable over by Sato in view of Siddiqui US Patent 6,826,176. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims are dependent from either claim 65, 80 or 92, and therefore, require a “service ID.” In rejecting these claims, the Examiner argues that Sato’s multicast management table discloses the concept of the “service ID” claimed by Applicant. Thus, as discussed above, these claims are also patentable because Sato’s multicast management table includes information which identifies the content server providing the multicast service, but does not include sufficient information to identify the multicast service itself.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2007

By: 

Kam T. Yam, Reg. No. 35,756
(858) 651-5563

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502